	NITED STATES DISTRI RTHERN DISTRICT OF (SELECT DIVISION	CALIFORNIA	ick
United States of America,) Cas	e No. 24-238	124-7146S
Plaintiff, v. Moises Hernardes Defendant(s).		PULATED ORDER EXC DER THE SPEEDY TRI	CLUDING TIME
For the reasons stated by the parties on the Trial Act from	he public and the def	endant in a speedy trial.	ice served by the See 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continual See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)		result in a miscarriage of	ijustice.
The case is so unusual or s defendants, the natu or law, that it is unreasonal itself within the time limits	re of the prosecution, the to expect adequate	or the existence of preparation for pretrial preparation	f novel questions of fact proceedings or the trial
Failure to grant a continual taking into account the exe	ce would deny the do	efendant reasonable time . See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(l	to obtain counsel, 1)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continua counsel's other scheduled See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7	ase commitments, ta	bly deny the defendant co king into account the exe	ntinuity of counsel, given reise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continua necessary for effective pre See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7	paration, taking into a		
With the consent of the de disposition of criminal cas paragraph and — based on the time limits for a prelimextending the 30-day time exclusions set forth above	es, the court sets the parties' showing inary hearing under Feriod for an indictm	oreliminary hearing to the of good cause — finds go of good cause — finds go cederal Rule of Criminal lent under the Speedy Tria	date set forth in the first bod cause for extending Procedure 5.1 and for al Act (based on the
IT IS SO ORDERED.		5 1 1A	1
DATED: 11/15/24		nomas S. Hixso ited States Magistrate Juc	
STIPULATED:	_(Just	
Attorney for Def	ndant As	sistant United States Atto	rney

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SELECT DIVISION

United State	es of America,)	Case No.
	Plaintiff,)))	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
	Defendant(s).)	
Trial Act from continuance outwe	igh the best interest of the pul	blic and th	, the court excludes time under the Speedy and finds that the ends of justice served by the e defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § is continuance on the following factor(s):
	ure to grant a continuance wo 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i)		ely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defe or I	endants, the nature of t aw, that it is unreasonable to	he prosect expect ade	the number of the existence of novel questions of fact equate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
Fai tak	lure to grant a continuance woing into account the exercise of	ould deny of due dili	the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, gence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
cou	lure to grant a continuance wo nsel's other scheduled case of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv	ommitmer	sonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given its, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
nec	lure to grant a continuance we essary for effective preparation 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(in	on, taking	sonably deny the defendant the reasonable time into account the exercise of due diligence.
dis par the ext	position of criminal cases, the agraph and — based on the patime limits for a preliminary ending the 30-day time period	court sets arties' sho hearing ui I for an in	ing into account the public interest in the prompt in the preliminary hearing to the date set forth in the first wing of good cause — finds good cause for extending order Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1 and for dictment under the Speedy Trial Act (based on the im. P. 5.1; 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b).
IT IS SO	ORDERED.		
DATED:			
		•	United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULA	TED: Attorney for Defendant		Assistant United States Attorney
	Attorney for Determann	•	Assistant Onited States Attorney